

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-18, 23, 25-31 and 33 were currently pending. Claims 1-18 and 23 have been cancelled without prejudice and claim 33 has been amended hereinabove. Claims 25-31 are allowed.

§103 Rejections of Claims 1-18 & 23

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohn, U.S. Patent No. 5,261,063 ("Kohn") and Davis, U.S. Patent No. US 5,357,617A ("Davis"). This rejection is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the cancellation, without prejudice, of these claims.

Claims 3, 5, 6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohn and Davis in view of Eickemeyer, U.S. Patent No. 6,061,710A ("Eickemeyer"). This rejection is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the cancellation, without prejudice, of these claims.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohn and Davis in view of Nguyen, U.S. Patent No. 5,961,628A ("Nguyen"). This rejection is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the cancellation, without prejudice, of this claim.

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohn and Davis in view of Narayanaswami, U.S. Patent No. 5,973,705A ("Narayanaswami"). This rejection is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the cancellation, without prejudice, of these claims.

Claims 14, 16, 17 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohn, U.S. Patent No. 5,261,063 ("Kohn") and Davis, U.S. Patent No. US 5,357,617A ("Davis"), in view of Krishna, U.S. Patent No. 6,161,173A ("Krishna"). This rejection is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the cancellation, without prejudice, of these claims.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohn, Davis and Krishna in view of Eickemeyer. This rejection is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the cancellation, without prejudice, of this claim.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohn, Davis and Krishna in view of Nguyen, U.S. Patent No. 5,961,628A (“Nguyen”). This rejection is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the cancellation, without prejudice, of this claim.

### §103 Rejection of Claim 33

Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joffe, U.S. Patent No. 6,330,584 B1 (“Joffe”) in view of Krishna. This rejection is respectfully traversed and it is submitted that this claim recites subject matter which is patentable over Joffe and Krishna.


Independent claim 33 has been amended hereinabove to recite that the “checking to see if all of said plurality of programs are completed” expressly includes the checking to see if the first program is completed. See the present disclosure at Figure 4 and page 18, lines 7-10, where it is stated (with emphasis added) that “... decision block 406 determines if this program and all of the programs of the current set are complete”. This is in contrast to the teaching of Joffe at column 2, lines 29-39, as cited by the Examiner, where it states (with emphasis added) that “If a task attempts to access an unavailable resource, the task is suspended .... When the resource becomes available, the suspended task is resumed, and the instruction accessing the resource is re-executed .... the task does not get access to the same resource until after every other task sharing the resource has finished accessing the resource.” In other words, assuming arguendo that the Examiner considers the “attempting task” of Joffe (i.e., the “task attempt[ing] to access an unavailable resource”) to correspond to the presently recited “first program”, such task has not been completed, but merely suspended. It is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the presently claimed invention, even with any additional knowledge provided by Krishna, to so drastically modify the system of Joffe. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 33 is patentable over Joffe and Krishna.

Conclusion

Claims 25-31 and 33 remain pending in this case. Based upon the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable, and reconsideration and early allowance of these claims are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 3, 2010

By:   
Mark A. Dalla Valle  
Registration No. 34,147

VEDDER PRICE P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Tel: (312) 609-7620  
FAX: (312) 609-5005